

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

In the Official Action mailed **April 23, 2004** the Examiner reviewed claims 1-10, 13-22, and 25-33. Claims 1-5, 9, 13-17, 21, and 25-29 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Devarakonda et al. (USPN 6,424,992, hereinafter “Devarakonda”) in view of Kunzelman et al. (USPN 6,041,357, hereinafter “Kunzelman”). Claims 6, 7, 10, 18, 19, 22, 30, 31, and 33 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Devarakonda in view of Kunzelman in further view of Fielder et al. (USPN 6,105,133, hereinafter “Fielder”). Claims 8, 20, and 32 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Devarakonda in view of Kunzelman in further view of Kennedy et al. (USPN 6,134,582, hereinafter “Kennedy”).

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 1, 13, and 25 were rejected as being unpatentable over Devarakonda in view of Kunzelman in further view of Kennedy. Applicant respectfully points out that Devarakonda teaches that it is necessary to renegotiate **a new session key** when routing to another node in the cluster (see Devarakonda col. 5, lines 21-27).

In contrast, the present invention discloses and claims transferring state information **including a session key** (an encryption key) from an existing secure session between a client and a second server to a first server to establish secure communications between the client and the first server without the need to establish a new encryption key (see page 10, lines 2-19 of the instant application). Transferring state information including a session key from an existing secure session between a client and a second server to a first server is advantageous because it allows the client to establish secure communications between the client

and the first server without the need to establish a new encryption key. Note that establishing a new encryption is a time consuming and costly process.


Accordingly, Applicant has amended independent claims 1, 13, and 25 to clarify that the present invention transfers state information including a session key from an existing secure session between a client and a second server to a first server to establish secure communications between the client and the first server without the need to establish a new encryption key. These amendments find support on page 10, lines 2-19 of the instant application.

Hence, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claims 1, 13, and 25 as presently amended are in condition for allowance. Applicant also submits that claims 2-10, which depend upon claim 1, claims 14-22, which depend upon claim 13, and claims 26-33, which depend upon claim 25, are for the same reasons in condition for allowance and for reasons of the unique combinations recited in such claims.

CONCLUSION

Applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

Respectfully submitted,

By 
Edward J. Grundler
Reg. No. 47,615

Date: May 5, 2004

Edward J. Grundler
PARK, VAUGHAN & FLEMING LLP
508 Second Street, Suite 201
Davis, CA 95616-4692
Tel: (530) 759-1663
FAX: (530) 759-1665